because "she will fill them up with all kinds of misrepresentations." The confinement of his wife as well as his daughter in the Asylum seems to have become a local scandal, with himself the principal villain. He clearly fears the daughter's ability to persuade people that she has been unjustly confined. The father is especially annoyed by a letter from one of his daugher's friends, complaining about Miss Adams's treatment in the Asylum, and recommending that she be cared for by a trained nurse in a private hospital. This friend's letter is also preserved, in which she reports that Miss Adams is confined in a ward "where she is constantly struck by other patients," has only only one pair of drawers, and needs to have her teeth done.

Rather than justify or redress the conditions of Miss Adams's confinement, Dr. Clarke makes them a matter of professional -- and male -- jurisdiction and even mystification. He writes the father on December 31 that "it is extremely difficult for outsiders to understand the true condition of affairs and there are always certain women will `step in where Angels fear to tread'." Such difficulty might have been used to argue for paying more attention to what "insiders" such as patients had to say. Clarke informs the father that his letter was read just as the annoying friend called again to take Miss Adams downtown; she was not allowed to see her. It occurs to neither father nor physician, that if Miss Adams had no ground for complaint before, she might now -- denied not just the right of communicating directly with the outside world, but also of having anyone else communicate with it for her. It was not just her the authorities wanted to control.

Miss Adams's letter to her father of September 5, 1907, is a mixture of explicit gratitude and implicit criticism and concern. She obliquely praises her father by praising the authorities for keeping their promises "just as you do." Indirectly praising him by comparing his behaviour to behaviour which she was known to have criticized, leaves the actual nature of his conduct, and her response to it, ambiguous. Such "praise" could very well have been veiled criticism or at least a reminder that its being praise (and not blame or satire) was contingent on performance.

Later in the same letter she remarks the promises of her father and many other visitors she understood "were to come by promise," but whom (of course) she never saw. But by now the meaning of "keeping your promise" has been